

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4, 11-17, 19-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (US 4,985,930).

Claims 9, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Hashiya et al. (US 6,333,997).

Claims 5-8 and 10 stand objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, and dependent claims 2-4, 10, 11, 23 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are presently pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, Claims 1-4, 11-17, 19-21 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Takeda et al. (US 4,985,930) and claims 9, 18, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Takeda et al. in view of Hashiya et al. (US 6,333,997). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action alleges that Takeda et al. teaches “a predetermined pixel block extraction part (step 113 of FIG. 4) that extracts a predetermined pixel block (step 113 of FIG. 4 detects or extracts the four lines of frame 38 of FIG. 2) that appears commonly (the four

extracted lines appear in common on any image that enters the process represented as 22 and 23 of FIG. 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, as amended, all include the features of, “analyzes a layout of the input document image in plural pages stored in the image memory part, determines at least one pixel block in the input image, and extracts a predetermined pixel block that appears commonly on at least some pages from a plurality of the at least one pixel block, and deciding the at least one of a plurality of pixel block as a predetermined pixel block.” Applicant respectfully submits that at least these features of amended independent claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21 are neither taught nor suggested by Takeda et al. and Hashiya et al., whether taken singly or combined.

In contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Takeda et al. teaches that as depicted in FIG. 2, rectangular frames 33 and 38 (col. 4, lines 53-63) are added to the input image to enclose every information appearing on the page so that alignment of the input image is corrected. Applicant respectfully submits that frames 33 and 38 do not divide the information apart into multiple sub-frames in which each sub-frame contains a specific information. However, Takeda et al. is completely silent about dividing the input image on each page into multiple sub-frames and using one of the sub-frames as a predetermined pixel block, rather Takeda et al. adds extra information to the input image and using such extra information as the predetermined pixel block.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that since Takeda et al. fails to teach or suggest every element of at least amended independent claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, Takeda et al. fails to anticipate at least amended independent claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21,

and hence dependent claims 3, 5-14, 18, 22 and 23. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Hashiya et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of Takeda et al.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103 (a) be withdrawn because the above-discussed novel combinations of features are neither taught nor suggested by Takeda et al. and Hashiya et al., whether taken singly or combined. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-14, 18, 22 and 23 are in condition for allowance with regard to amended independent claims 1, 15, and 19 upon which they respectively depend, as well as the individual features of dependent claims 2-14, 18, 22 and 23 recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.R.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above,
such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Registration No. 33,652

Dated: April 25, 2005

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001